UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/679,109 | 10/04/2000 | Lewis D. Dodrill | CIS00-2413 | 1822 | |
| 58406 BARRY W. CH | 7590 06/02/200 IAPIN, ESO. | EXAMINER | | | |
| CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE, SUITE 280 | | | HAN, QI | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WESTBOROU | GH, MA 01581 | 2626 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 06/02/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 09/679,109 | DODRILL ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| QI HAN | 2626 | | |

| | QI HAN | 2626 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1 | , | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | l'anna l'illa 07 OFD 44 07 ma at la s | 91- d - 90-2- (0- | 6 (- 1 - 1 6 |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| | | 20 (la (a d la | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1) | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (l | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea vand was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fail: e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | • | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other: | | | |
| /Richemond Dorvil/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626 | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the newly amended and argued limitations (i.e. "the output of the first executable is a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resources locator comprising ..." for claim 3, "wherein the executable resource generates text portions from the body of text by dividing the body of the text into the text portions, and the output of the first executable is a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resources locator comprising ..." for claim 5, "wherein the generating text portions from the body of text is performed by dividing the body of the text into the text portions, and the output includes a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resources locator comprising ..." for claims 8, 13, 15 and 20, and "wherein the executable resource generates text portions from the body of text by dividing the body of the text into the text portions, and the output of the executable is a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resources locator comprising ..." for claims 17, "wherein a first executable resource generates text portions from the body of text by dividing the body of the text into the text portions, and the output of the first executable is a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resources locator comprising ..." for claim 23 and 27, "wherein the generating includes generating text portions from the body of text by dividing the body of the text into the text portions, and the output of the first executable is a sequence of uniform resource locators for each text portion, the uniform resource locator comprising ..." for claim 25) introduce new issue(s) and/or change the scope of the claims, which require further consideration and/or search.

It is noted that the previous objection (see final rejection filed on 12/19/2007) that indicated that claims 33-34 "would be allowable if rewritten in indepenent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervning claims", is only based on the combined limitations of claim 1 and its dependent claims 33-34 for indicating the reason of allowable subject matter. Since other independent claims, such as claims 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23, 25, and 27, have different limitations/scopes from claim 1, the newly added limitations to these claims introduce new issue(s) and/or change the scope of the claims, which require further consideration and/or search.